

**REMARKS**

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-12 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Junqua (USP no. 6,415,257).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the examiner's reason for rejecting the claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, applicant has elected to amend the independent claims to more clearly state the invention. More specifically, applicant has amended the claims to recite that the user models are derived "from determined details about the style of speech of user inputs and/or details about interactions in dialogs between users and the dialog system (1)."

Junqua, as read by the applicant, recites a system for identifying and adapting a TV-user profile by means of speech technology that controls interaction with television using speech, whereby each user of the system may have a set of determined preferences that are automatically selected through identification/verification of the speaker's voice. (see col. 1, lines 8-11). Junqua further teaches that the function of the verification/identification module is to identify the identity of the speaker so that a user profile appropriate for the speaker can be loaded into the system (see col. 2, lines 47-49). Junqua further teaches that the "verification module greatly improves the ability of the ... parser and recognizer to perform this task by loading user profile data designed to fine tune the semantic representation of the user's spoken input." (see col. 3, lines 31-34). Hence, Junqua discusses speaker profiles that are already loaded on to the system that may be used to improve the ability of the system to perform the requested spoken tasks. Junqua fails to disclose "deriving user models from determined details about the style of speech of user inputs and/or details about interactions in dialogs between users and the dialog system (1)," as is recited in the claims. Rather, Junqua has pre-existing user profiles (or models) and uses these models to improve the system response.

It is well recognized that to constitute a rejection pursuant to 35 USC §102, i.e., anticipation, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art.

Junqua cannot be said to anticipate the invention recited in independent claim 1 because Junqua fails to disclose material element claimed. More specifically, Junqua fails to disclose the element "deriving user model from determined details about style of speech," as is recited in the claim.

Having shown that Junqua fails to disclose a material element claimed, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

With regard to independent claim 7, this claim was rejected for the same reason used in rejecting claim 1 and has been amended in a manner similar to that of claim 1. Hence, for the amendment made to the claims and for the remarks made with regard to claim 1, which are applicable and reasserted, as if in full, applicant submits that claim 7 includes subject matter not disclosed by Junqua and, thus, is patently distinguishable from, and allowable over, the apparatus disclosed by Junqua. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 7.

With regard to claim 3, this claim depends from claim 1, which has been shown to be allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, claim 3 is also allowable by virtue of its dependency upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junqua in view of Larsen (IEEE Publication).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the examiner's reason for rejecting the claims.

A claimed invention is *prima facie* obvious when three basic criteria are met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings therein. Second, there must be a reasonable

expectation of success. And, third, the prior art reference or combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, which as argued above, is allowable over the Junqua reference as this reference teaches or suggests deriving a user model from user inputs.

Larsen teaches an experiment for determining a dialogue management strategy wherein an inexperienced user may prefer to use a direct system and an experienced user may prefer to use a shorter system. Larsen further teaches that “the user must be able to use unconstrained natural speech [and] this often calls for an elaborate model. ... However, when addressing well structured tasks as the present one, this might be avoided and a much simpler model can be employed.” (see page 68, lines 1-5). Hence, rather than teaching deriving models from user inputs, Larsen avoids this complexity completely and uses a model that is simpler because of the fixed inputs used in the experiment. Hence, Larsen fails to teach, and even teaches away from, using the speech inputs to derive the user models claims.

Having shown that Junqua and Larsen, individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest material elements claimed in claim 1, applicant submits that the present invention, as recited in dependent claims 2 and 4 is not rendered obvious by the cited references because one would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Junqua and Larsen as is suggested by the Office Action. Applicant further submits that even if the teachings of the cited references were combined, the present invention would not be rendered obvious as the combined invention would not include all the elements claims.

For the above remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junqua in view of Toyama (USP no. 6,502,082).

With regard to claim 12, this claim depends from claim 8, which has been shown to be allowable over Junqua as Junqua fails to disclose a material element claimed. Toyama is also silent with regard to deriving user models from user inputs. Hence, the

combination of Janqua and Toyama fails to render obvious the present invention as recited in claim 12, as the combined device fails to disclose all the elements claims.


For the above remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Although the last Office Action was made final, this amendment should be entered. Claims 1 and 7 and 8 have each been amended to more clearly state the invention. Since no matter has been added to the claims that would require comparison with the prior art or any further review only require a cursory review is required by the examiner. The amendment therefore should be entered without requiring a showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b).

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Vodopia  
Registration No. 36,299

Date: February 10, 2005

By:   
Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
John Vodopia, Registration No. 36,299  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on February 10, 2005.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

  
(Signature and Date)